

REMARKS

Amendment to the Specification

The Applicant has corrected some informalities in the specification and also made
5 some implicit statements explicit. The amendments are made without adding new
matter to the specification.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

10 The Examiner rejects claims **1-18** under 35 USC § 112 as being indefinite for
failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which
applicant regards as the invention. Claims **1** and **10** recite the limitation “said
coordinates of said atoms of said first protein and said atomic coordinates of said
atoms in said second protein” in steps (d), and (f) -(g) of each claim and lack
15 antecedent basis. Claims **2-9** and **11-18** are rejected due to their dependency from
claim **1** or **10** and thus containing the indefinite limitation.

In reply, applicant has amended claims **1** and **10**. Accordingly, the Applicant
respectfully submits that the rejection be withdrawn.

20

Claim Objections

1. Claims **2-9** are objected to under 37 CFR1.75(c), as being of improper
dependent format for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.
The examiner points out that claims **2-9** depend on claim **1** and are directed to a
25 method. However, claim **1** is directed to a program storage device.

In reply, applicant has amended claims **1-9** and directed these claims to a program
storage device. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that the objection
be withdrawn.

30

2. Claims **1-9** are objected to because of the phrase “comprising of” in claim **1** and its dependant claims **2-9**.

In reply, applicant has adopted the examiners suggestion and amended claim **1** to
5 “comprising” instead of “comprising of”. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that the objection be withdrawn.

3. Claims **1-18** are objected to because the meaning of the steps (a) and (b) of claim **1** and **10** is not instantly clear. The examiner has suggested that steps (a)
10 and (b) be amended to recite “receiving the atomic coordinates of.....” instead of “receiving a first protein with N1 atoms” or “receiving a second protein with N2 atoms”.

In reply, applicant has adopted the examiners suggestion and amended claims **1**
15 and **10**. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that the objection be withdrawn.

IN CONCLUSION

This reply encompasses a bona fide attempt to overcome the objections and rejections raised by the Examiner and the reasons why the Applicant believes the objections and rejections should be withdrawn. Accordingly, allowance of the
5 claims now in the application is kindly requested.

Respectfully submitted,

10



Dr. Ron Jacobs

Reg. No. 50,142

15

LUMEN Intellectual Property Services

2345 Yale Street, 2nd Floor

Palo Alto, CA 94306-1429

Phone: (650) 424-0100

Fax: (650) 424-0141

Email: ron@lumen.com

20